

Responses to Public Comments
Klamath River Sport Fishing Regulations
February 3, 2006 – June 23, 2006

Section 7.50(b)(91.1) Klamath River Sport Fishing Regulations

(1) Thomas Weseloh, CalTrout, e-mail and letter to the Commission on January 31, 2006, 2 e-mails and one letter to the Commission on February 17, 2006, and letter to the Commission on June 9, 2006:

- a. They requested the Trinity River main stem from 250 feet below Lewiston Dam to Old Lewiston Bridge open April 1 instead of the last Saturday in April for catch and release fly fishing with a zero bag limit. They initially requested January 1 in their first letter and modified the request to April 1 in the later letters.

Response:

- a. Support noted.

(2) Jack Scarbrough, e-mail to the Commission on February 23, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about long closures in the Shelter Cove area in July for salmon.
- b. He would like to have the season closed every other day or every two days.
- c. He would like to limit the fishing to just the weekends or other short periods of time.
- d. He suggested the use of a punch card approach could also work.

Response:

- a. This comment can't be addressed by these regulations.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. Punch cards are already in use in the Klamath Basin.

(3) Dick Enderle, e-mail to the Commission on February 25, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about the proposed federal salmon fishing ban along the west coast.
- b. He wants the commercial industry to be the only fishery to close.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.

(4) Dan Gracia, e-mail to the Commission on February 27, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about the proposed commercial fishing ban along the west coast.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.

(5) Ken Hardy (2/24), Donald Hensic (2/28) , Brian Robbers (3/1), Allen and Susan Tittle (3/6), John Wax (3/7), Betty McDonald (3/31), , separate e-mails to the Commission during February and March 2006; and Michael McHenry letter received March 22, 2006 by the Commission:

- a. They are concerned about the proposed federal salmon fishing ban along the west coast.
- b. They support the Ticehurst plan for the ocean salmon fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.

(6) Will Bateman, e-mail to Commission on February 28, 2006:

- a. He wants the ocean sport fishery off Morro Bay to remain open in 2006 since no Klamath River fall Chinook are landed by their fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.

(7) George Kautsky, e-mail and letter to Commission on February 28, 2006:

- a. He wants catch and release steelhead fly fishing on the Salmon River during September and October for the same areas of the river open during November through February season.

Response:

- a. This area was closed to reduce hooking mortality on Chinook and coho salmon stocks.

(8) Ed Duggan, Trinity Fishery Guide and Trinity River Restoration, e-mail to Commission on March 1, 2006, and Richard and Janet Starr e-mail to Commission dated March 11, 2006:

- a. They want to keep one hatchery trout or steelhead and one brown trout.

Response:

- a. Support noted.

(9) Mark Coleman, e-mail to the Commission on March 1, 2006:

- a. He wants to make the ocean season shorter, impose stricter regulations, but do not suspend and prohibit salmon fishing for the 2006 season.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.

(10) Donald Mintz, e-mail to the Commission on March 5, 2006:

- a. He doesn't understand the reason for the proposed federal fishing ban along the west coast.
- b. He suggests that we release hatchery fish on the Klamath River until the water flows are restored.

Response:

- a. The proposed ban was to protect the 2006 low abundance of the Klamath River fall Chinook.
- b. There are already two hatcheries that release fish in the Klamath Basin.

(11) Rich Standow, e-mail to the Commission on March 4, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about the proposed federal fishing ban along the west coast.
- b. He suggests that they be allowed to fish until the Klamath River is restored.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. This request will cause further harm to the Klamath River fall Chinook and result in larger fishery closures.

(12) Jay Halbert, e-mail to the Commission on March 7, 2006:

- a. He would like to see a twenty fish yearly limit for areas south of Horse Mountain by using a four-salmon upgrade stamp that can be purchased 5 times.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.

(13) Paul Beck, e-mail to the Commission on March 11, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about the proposed federal salmon fishing ban along the west coast due to the Klamath River issues.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.

(14) Tom Hart, Fishermen's Association of Moss Landing, letter to the Commission on March 22, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about the salmon runs on the Klamath River.
- b. He is willing to work with the Commission to use Salmon Stamp funds to restore the Klamath River similar to their efforts to restore the Central Valley.

Response:

- a. Comment noted.
- b. Support for using the Salmon Stamp funds noted.

(15) Dean Estep, e-mail and letter to the Commission on March 17, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about the proposed federal salmon fishing ban along the west coast due to the Klamath River issues
- b. He is concerned about the effect on the commercial salmon industry.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.

(16) 476 people sent a "form letter" e-mail titled "Potential California Salmon Closure" to the Commission during March and April 2006:

- a. I am concerned about the potential over-ride by the NMFS of an upcoming decision by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) that would allow for a limited 2006 ocean salmon season.
- b. It is my understanding that NMFS is proposing to close the entire California coast and part of the Oregon coast to ocean salmon fishing. I urge you to prevent NMFS from overriding the PFMC's decision.
- c. I also urge you to find a reasonable solution by directing NMFS to work with the Council to pass an emergency rule to forestall complete closure, and instead provide for a season that will address salmon population concerns without the severe economic impact of a complete closure.

- d. To avoid this problem in the future, it will be critical to address the underlying causes of the decline of the salmon population in the Klamath River.
- e. At their March 6-10 meeting, the PFMC was faced with making a decision on the 2006 salmon harvest. I find it unreasonable that NMFS presented its recommendation to the PFMC on Friday March 10, the last day of the five day meeting. This allowed for no analysis of the data and no debate on the recommendations. This is especially egregious since NMFS recommended a complete closure of all harvest in California and part of Oregon.
- f. I firmly believe that a reasonable compromise can be developed if there is the will to do so. To date, NMFS has been unwilling to consider a workable solution. The NMFS opinion was developed without the input of the affected parties and was the most severe measure possible.
- g. Again, I urge you to direct NMFS to work with the PFMC to pass an emergency rule to forestall complete closure, and instead provide for a season that will address population concerns without the severe economic impact of a complete closure.

Response:

- a. The NMFS adopted an emergency rule to approve the April PFMC adopted west coast salmon season and the Commission adopted the same regulations.
- b. See Response 16a.
- c. See Response 16a.
- d. See Response 2a.
- e. See Response 2a.
- f. See Response 2a.
- g. See Response 16a.

(17) Dick Pool (3/31), Al Myers (4/12), and Louis Robinette (4/28), separate e-mails to the Commission during March and April 2006:

- a. They want full support of the PFMC recommended salmon season.

Response:

- a. See Response 16a.

(18) Stuart Gall, e-mail to the Commission on March 31, 2006:

- a. He wants the government to put the needs of fish before the need for water exports.
- b. He wants more effort on the Klamath River to ensure the Klamath River fall Chinook do not become endangered like the Sacramento River winter Chinook.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. Comment noted.

(19) Gary Phillips, e-mail to the Commission on April 5, 2006:

- a. He wants the Governor to attend the April PFMC meeting to support California.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.

(20) Paul Venker, e-mail to the Commission on April 5, 2006:

- a. He wants the Commission to support the PFMC March Option.

Response:

- a. See Response 16a.

(21) Frank Emerson, Community Alliance for Sustainable Fisheries, oral comments at April 7, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. We should pay the Klamath River harvester's not to fish this year.
- b. We need to maintain our ocean fisheries.
- c. This conservation issue has serious impacts to local businesses.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. Concern for the impacts on local businesses noted.

(22) Jim Martin, Recreational Fishing Alliance, oral comments at April 7, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. They support the present catch and release fishery proposed for the Klamath River.
- b. They support the 3% river sport allocation
- c. They support the PFMC adopted season.

Response:

- a. Support for the Klamath River catch and release fishery noted.
- b. Support for the 3% river sport allocation is noted.
- c. See Response 16a.

(23) Tom Raftican, United Anglers of Southern California, United

Anglers of California, and Coastside Fishing Club, oral comments at April 7, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. They support the present 3% river sport allocation
- b. They support the PFMC adopted season.

Response:

- a. See Response 22b.
- b. See Response 16a.

(24) Paul Weakland, oral comments at the April 7, 2006, May 4, 2006, and June 23, 2006 Commission meetings and a handout at the April 7, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. He stated the sport fishermen harvest 5 times more fish than the commercial fisherman and have a higher impact on Klamath River fall Chinook.
- b. He provided a handout that he stated shows the sport harvest was much higher than the commercial harvest.
- c. He stated the number of sport and commercial fishermen is left out of the evaluation.
- d. He stated the federal government has lied to the public.
- e. He provide a handout about the Naval acoustical work off the California coast.
- f. What are the statistical margin of errors?
- g. The fishermen are being punished for the actions of the federal government.
- h. The river die-off is just like an abalone die-off.

Response:

- a. The PFMC data show that the commercial fishery has a higher harvest and Klamath River fall Chinook impact.
- b. The handout was about Department trout planting and not sport harvests.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. See Response 2a.
- e. See Response 2a.
- f. See Response 2a.
- g. See Response 2a.
- h. See Response 2a.

(25) 236 people sent a "form letter" e-mail titled "Support the PFMC's Plan for Salmon Fishing" and 484 people sent a "form letter" e-mail titled "Salmon Fishing in California and Oregon" to the Commission during April 2006. Both "form letter" e-mails contain the same text:

- a. After much review and debate, the PFMC has decided that it is supportable to open a very limited salmon fishery season in

California and part of Oregon this year. This decision will now go to your department for review and approval. I urge you to support the PFMC in its decision and approve the PFMC's recommendation.

- b. As you are undoubtedly aware, this decision came after the PFMC heard of the enormous adverse economic impact that a season closure would have on both the commercial and recreational fishing sectors. They had to weigh that consideration against the essential goal of ensuring the sustainability of the Klamath Chinook salmon. The PFMC proposal will still adversely impact the California and Oregon economies, but it represents a compromise that gives some protection to recreational fishing interests.
- c. This crisis, however, is part of a longer term, larger problem. The issues of how to build the fishery and to restore the river system remain. I am encouraged by efforts that have recently brought together various agencies and private stakeholders on the river system. I urge your agency to fully support such efforts so that we can avoid facing another fishery crisis in the future.
- d. We also applaud the recommendation by the NMFS for mitigation measures to be included in the relicensing of the hydropower dams on the Klamath. The river can support a sizable and sustainable fishery if all interests work to establish the best management system for all uses of the river.

Response:

- a. See Response 16a.
- b. See Response 16a.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. See Response 2a.

(26) Daniel Castro (4/2), Clifford Pierce (4/2), Steve Vaughan (4/3), John Duran (4/5), Marguerite Krupin (4/13) and Bonnie Bourn (4/20), separate e-mails to the Commission during April 2006:

- a. They are concerned about the proposed salmon fishing ban along the west coast.

Response:

- c. See Response 2a.

(27) Allen Lillieberg (4/23 & 4/24), Don Allan (4/21), Ken Fetcho (4/22), and Dane Durham (4/24), separate e-mails to the Commission during April 2006:

- a. They want the Commission to limit the harvest of spring Chinook on the Klamath and Trinity Rivers.
- b. They want the Commission to implement a closure on the

Klamath River below Weitchpec to coincide with the Yurok tribal closure.

Response:

- a. There are area closures enacted that benefit Klamath River spring Chinook and no further action is warranted at this time.
- b. The regulations provide appropriate protection with the Klamath River fall Chinook adult ban and no further action is warranted at this time.

(28) Bonnie Bourn, letter to Commission on April 12, 2006:

- a. She is concerned about the proposed commercial salmon fishing ban during July 2006.
- b. She is concerned the effect of the commercial ban on the Sacramento stocks with too many fish returning to the river.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.

(29) Ann Maurice (Ad Hoc Committee), fax to the Commission on April 21, 2006:

- a. She does want to keep the salmon season open and do not curtail ocean fishing.
- b. She provided analysis of the status of the Klamath River runs that shows that low Klamath River escapements will not harm the stocks.
- c. She raised numerous issues concerning water management in the Klamath River basin.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. The analysis did not consider the effects of varied age structure and year classes in the annual Klamath run which was considered by the PFMC in their risk-analysis before allowing the 2006 fishing season.
- c. See Response 2a.

(30) Peter Brucker, Salmon Restoration Council (4/23 & 4/24) and Scott Greacen, Environmental Protection Information Center (4/21 & 4/24), separate e-mails and letters to the Commission during April 2006:

- a. They want the Commission to eliminate the harvest of Klamath River spring Chinook.
- b. They want to implement an in-river closure to coincide with the Yurok tribal closures.

- c. The Department needs to provide more support for restoration and protection of spring Chinook.

Response:

- a. See Response 27a.
- b. See Response 27b.
- c. See Response 27a.

(31) Douglas Cole, e-mail to the Commission on April 24, 2006:

- a. He supports the establishment of a "catch and release only" sport fishery on the Mid Klamath.
- b. Further reductions in impact to the fishery by sport fishing may be accomplished by establishing a single hook rule on all terminal tackle.
- c. He wants to open closed areas to barbless hook, catch and release fishing, and by establishing a more strict regulation on multiple hook terminal tackle.

Response:

- a. See Response 22a.
- b. See Response 27b.
- c. The closed areas provide additional protection and no further gear restrictions are warranted at this time.

(32) Patrick Mc Calmont, e-mail to the Commission on April 23 2006:

- a. He wanted a public hearing on the Klamath River regulations in Weaverville, Trinity County.

Response:

- a. The Commission decided to hold only one hearing in Crescent City.

(33) Felice Pace, Klamath River Keeper, e-mail to the Commission on April 21, 2006 and oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. He wants the Commission to limit the harvest of Klamath River spring Chinook.
- b. He wants the Commission to limit tribal harvest of Klamath River spring Chinook.
- c. He want fishing with bait to be eliminated on the Klamath River

Response:

- a. See Response 27a.
- b. See Response 27b.
- c. No further gear restrictions are warranted at this time.

(34) Emely Wilson, e-mail to the Commission on April 27, 2006:

- a. She is concerned about the proposed adult fish ban on the Trinity River.
- b. She wants a small adult quota with unlimited catch and release.
- c. She wants to keep brown trout.
- d. She wants all hatchery fish marked to allow for retention of hatchery fish.

Response:

- a. The adult fish ban is required to meet the natural escapement goals for this year.
- b. See Response 34a.
- c. The present regulations already allow this measure.
- d. All hatchery trout and steelhead are already marked and marking all Chinook will cause escapement estimation problems with no clear solution.

(35) Ed Duggan, Trinity Fishery Guide and Trinity River Restoration, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing and letter to Commission dated April 27, 2006:

- a. He is concerned about the proposed adult fish ban on the Trinity River.
- b. He wants a fair adult quota for the river sport fishery.
- c. He is concerned that the ocean fishery is not giving a fair share to the river fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 34a.
- b. See Response 34a.
- c. See Response 2a.

(36) Richard Miles, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. He is concerned about the health of the Klamath River.
- b. He is concerned about the proposed adult fish ban on the Klamath River and its effect on the economy of the community.
- c. The local communities need disaster assistance.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 34a.
- c. See Response 2a.

(37) Chuck Blackburn, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission

hearing:

- a. He is concerned about the health of the Klamath River.
- b. He wants the Klamath River Task Force to get reauthorized.
- c. The river sport fishery needs more input into the PFMC.
- d. He would like the hatchery fish released before May to reduce the die-off issue due to low water.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. See Response 2a.

(38) Kenyen Hensel, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. He is concerned about the proposed adult fish ban on the Klamath River and its effect on the economy of the community.
- b. The local communities need disaster assistance.
- c. He wants a fair adult quota for the river sport fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 34a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. See Response 34a.

(39) Tim King, e-mail to Commission on April 3, 2006 and oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. He wants to allow fishing in the lower river.
- b. He wants the fish for a river sport fishery taken from the ocean fisheries allocation.
- c. He wants fair representation for the river sport fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 34a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. See Response 2a.

(40) Keith Abernathy, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. The river has a problem since the fish are not making it back to the spawning beds.
- b. He feels we need to fix the river first.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.

(41) Virginia Boswitch, KFMC River representative, letters to the Commission dated April 4, 2006 and April 11, 2006 and oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. She is concerned the PFMC will not allow any fishing for Klamath River fall Chinook and she is requesting a fishery for sub-adult Chinook and hatchery steelhead.
- b. She was to continue to be allowed to harvest spring Chinook.
- c. She provided her perspective of the PFMC process on how the 3% river allocation was developed by the PFMC.
- d. The KFMC had no clear recommendation for 15% share for the river sport.
- e. The 15% share for the river fishery would cost the ocean 2,000 fish.
- f. The KFMC chairperson did not bring forward the 15% recommendation.

Response:

- a. Support for sub-adult Chinook and hatchery steelhead noted.
- b. Support for spring Chinook fishery noted.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. See Response 2a.
- e. See Response 2a.
- f. See Response 2a.

(42) Jim Waldvogel, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. This is the first situation of this magnitude
- b. Offering 300 in-river fish at the expense of the KMZ ocean fishery is wrong as the KMZ has taken the brunt of cuts for the past.
- c. The tribes are getting more fish than last year. Please take 1,000 fish from the tribes and give them to river sport.
- d. The Commission should request the PFMC to give up 1,000 tribal fish.
- e. In-river fishermen are not getting a fair share at the credit card fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. The Commission has no authority over tribal fisheries.
- d. See Response 42c.
- e. See Response 2a.

(43) Gary Taylor, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. We need to save the fish.
- b. Every single fish is needed by the river fishery.
- c. Please remember that we are talking about people's lives and not just fish.

Response:

- a. See Response 34a.
- b. See Response 34a.
- c. See Response 34a.

(44) Adam Pricher, Klamath Lodgings Association, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. The community basis of income is tourism.
- b. 40% of their annual income is due to fishing.
- c. The commission has control of the livelihood of the community.
- d. Please think about the community.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. See Response 2a.

(45) Rich Mosshotder, river guide, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. The river fisheries management is the problem.
- b. Water temperature is not a problem.
- c. How we can take care of these fish and the river?
- d. Finclip all of the fish to allow fishermen to target only hatchery fish.
- e. Look at a plan for the next and following years
- f. Be careful of how we proceed

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. See Response 34d.
- e. See Response 2a.
- f. See Response 2a.

(46) Nick Thomas, river guide, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing:

- a. The river fisheries are not having the same impact of the ocean fisheries.
- b. We need to get the fish back into the river to spawn
- c. He sees a lot more fish than is shown in the reports
- d. We need to address the whole issue
- e. The money spent on lawsuits is taking away from the resources

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 2a.
- c. See Response 2a.
- d. See Response 2a.
- e. See Response 2a.

(47) Jimmy Smith, Humboldt County Supervisor and Chair of the Klamath Management Zone Fisheries Coalition, e-mail to the Commission on April 29, 2006 and Henry Doane, e-mail to Commission on April 28, 2006:

- a. They are concerned about proposed option to allow more fish for the Klamath River sport fishery at the expense of the ocean fishery in the Klamath Management Zone.
- b. They want full support of the PFMC adopted measures.

Response:

- a. Support for the KMZ ocean fishery noted
- b. See Response 16a.

(48) Frank and Cindy Woolsey (4/29), Bruce Gehrke (4/30), Hugh Washburn (5/1), and Jan Zieters (5/1), separate e-mails to the Commission during late April and May 2006:

- a. They support the PFMC recommended seasons.
- b. They don't want the KMZ ocean fishery to be cut at the expense of the Klamath River fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 16a.
- b. See Response 47a.

(49) Barney Currigan, e-mail to the Commission on April 29, 2006:

- a. He wants to all Klamath River hatchery fish marked to allow for retention of all hatchery fish.

Response:

- a. See Response 34d.

- (50) Jonathan Dunn, oral comments at April 27, 2006 Commission hearing and an e-mail to the Commission on May 1, 2006:
- a. He is concerned about proposed option to allow more fish for the Klamath River sport fishery at the expense of the ocean fishery in the Klamath Management Zone.

Response:

- a. See Response 47a.
- (51) Dan Wolford, Coastside Fishing Club, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:
- a. He is concerned that the problems with Klamath-Trinity River were not caused by recreational fishermen.
 - b. He reported that adding one fish to the in-river allotment requires a match for the tribes and occurs at the expense of many more ocean fishing opportunities.
 - c. He recommended adoption of seasons as proposed by the PFMC and adopted by NMFS.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
 - b. See Response 2a.
 - c. See Response 16a.
- (52) Zeke Grader, Pacific Coast Federated Fishermen's Associations, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:
- a. He requested the Commission send a letter to ask for fishery disaster relief from the federal government and to provide funds to fix the Klamath River.
 - b. He requested additional fishing opportunities for commercial salmon fishing in state waters that are compatible with PFMC measures.
 - c. He stated that the Klamath River needs a short and long term recovery plan.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
 - b. See Response 2a.
 - c. See Response 2a.
- (53) Jim Martin, Recreational Fishing Alliance, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:
- a. He discussed the PFMC process and the potential for providing

- an in-river allotment for next year.
- b. He supported the NMFS regulations.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 16a.

- (54) Roger Thomas, Golden Gate Fishermen's Association, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. He stated that the in-river fishing interests are not attending the PFMC and Klamath Council meetings and providing testimony.
- b. He supported the NMFS regulations.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 16a.

- (55) Darrell Ticehurst, PFMC at-large representative and recreational angler, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. He stated that the process to reach this year's regulations was very complicated, and any changes at this point would require starting the entire federal process again.
- b. He supported the NMFS regulations.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 16a.

- (56) Tom Raftican, United Anglers of Southern California, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. He spoke in support of the PFMC and NMFS plan as provided.
- b. He stated that any changes will start the whole process over because NMFS will have to re-evaluate.

Response:

- a. See Response 16a.
- b. See Response 2a.

- (57) Bob Strickland, United Anglers of California, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. He described the lack of guidance from NMFS during development of the best season for California.
- b. He supports the NMFS regulations.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. See Response 16a.

(58) Mike Rees, oral comments at May 4, 2006 Commission meeting:

- a. He requested opportunities for commercial salmon fishing in state waters. He stated that in three years, he has only caught one Klamath fish in the Bodega fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.

(59) Bills Woods, e-mail to Commission dated June 7, 2006:

- a. He supported the proposed changes for the ocean salmon sport fishery.
- b. He also appreciated the economic analysis provided by the Commission for the sport fishery.
- c. He requested similar information for the commercial fishery.

Response:

- a. See Response 2a.
- b. Comment noted.
- c. He was directed to the Pacific Fishery Management Council for more information.